'Shaping the Mentality of Races and Especially of Young People'[i]: The League of Nations and the Educational Cinematography Congress, 1934

Joyce Goodman

Cinematography surfaced as both an opportunity and a problem in discussion at League commissions, committees, advisory groups and institutions–notably those connected with intellectual cooperation, child welfare, health and mandates–as well as through League economic structures.[ii] Interest in cinematography was promoted at the 1926 conference organised in Paris by the League's Institute of Intellectual Cooperation (IIIC) but was institutionalised in 1928 in the Institute of Educational Cinematograph (IIEC) at Rome. The IIEC was located within League structures of intellectual cooperation and was networked with national committees of educational cinema established in a number of countries. Funded on behalf of the League by Benito Mussolini's government, the IIEC was an element in his strategy to present fascist Italy as modern and outward facing and the European centre of research on educational film. The IIEC's remit covered technical questions around cinematography, including the production, regulation, and exhibition of films; and the documentation, information, circulation and preservation of film. The IIEC conducted empirical studies, which it disseminated in its multilingual journal, *The International Review of Educational Cinematography (IREC),*[iii] which also printed papers from IIEC symposia and conferences, the largest of which, with 240 written submissions and over 700 delegates from 45 countries, was the IIEC's 1934 Rome congress.[iv]

Laura Dreyfus-Barney, a wealthy American living in Paris and the only female member of the 1934 IIEC congress bureau, reported to the League's Liaison Committee of Major International Associations that the 1934 IIEC congress made 'a special study of the influence of Cinematography on the mind' and that they had done so 'in connection with the idea of peace and international propaganda to promote knowledge and mutual understanding of the races'.[v] The chapter discusses the link between cinematography and intellectual co-operation and unpacks Dreyfus-Barney's statement by tracing how congressists linked views of the mind with the development of the world-mindedness that intellectual co-operation at the League sought to

foster as a means to world peace. The discussion draws on League of Nations records, IIEC congress presentations, papers published in the 1934 edition of *IREC,* and reports of Pan-Pacific women's congresses held in Honolulu. These are supplemented with papers in the Amazone archive in Brussels related to the 1934 IIEC congress and the International Council of Women's cinema committee, which Dreyfus-Barney chaired.[vi]

Cinematography and intellectual co-operation

Silent films were lauded at the League for their supposed universal application.[vii] At the IIEC congress, Cline Koon from the US Department of State used the language of cultural internationalism to reiterate the view that motion pictures transcended 'national frontiers, language barriers, illiteracy and ignorance'. 'Motion pictures', he said were 'the universal educators, the Esperantists of the universe' because the people of the world depended more on motion pictures for their information about the lives, traits of character and public policies of people in other countries than they did on diplomats.[viii] When the introduction of talking film in 1929 disrupted the notion of film as a universal language, the sound film, in which sound was synchronised with the visual narrative of the film, was seen as superior to 'talkies' for purposes of international co-operation on the grounds that film's supposed universal nature could be synchronised with the language of the country to which films were destined. A 1934 Report from the Tokyo Office of the League of Nations to the IIEC noted that sound films made it possible to see 'the peculiar characteristics of a people, its culture, its material progress and its type of civilisation' which could help peoples 'know one another, foster friendship and consequently peace'.[ix] This positioning of film as a universal form that also pointed to a multiverse of peoples resonated with views developed in the League's International Committee of Intellectual Cooperation (ICIC), where a double vision of oneness and manyness had been aligned with the philosophy of Henry Bergson, the ICIC's first chair, whose cinematic vision of mind wove together an evolutionary process encompassing a clock of time alongside heterogeneous developments that he thought were impelled by a vital force.[x]

Circulating alongside film as a positive mechanism for fostering friendship and peace were anxieties around film's potential for cultural misrepresentation and about the Americanisation of the film industry, both of which were thought to be inimical to stability and peace. A 1934 Report to the IIEC from the Indian Bureau of Calcutta complained about films that told the world 'how funny some find the religious beliefs of the inhabitants of India, China and other non-Christian countries', while 'sickly' American romances were located in settings that bore no relation to the life of the majority of Indian people.[xi] The Chinese Society for Educational Cinematography pointed to foreign films that attempted to picture Chinese life but were full of 'erroneous interpretations and indications to the detriment of the real China', while European and American films in China, the report maintained, largely deal with adultery and theft.[xii] Anxieties about the portrayal of the West circulated both at the League and around colonial regimes. At the 1927 London Imperial Education Conference, 'delegates from the tropics' had protested about the serious harm from the 'exhibition of unsuitable films that on the one hand misrepresent the social life of European peoples and on the other shock the religious and moral sensibilities of tropical peoples'.[xiii] The 1928 Pan-Pacific Women's conference sent a resolution to Will Hays, president of the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America, to confine the distribution of films in the Pacific to those that 'reflect the best, not the worst in life',[xiv] a point that Australian Beatrice Tildesley reiterated at the 1930 Pan-Pacific Women's Conference, and in her report to the IIEC on film in Australia.[xv]

How this 'double gesture of hope and fear' about educational cinematography as an element of international cooperation played out at the 1934 IIEC congress lies at the heart of the chapter.[xvi]The IIEC defined educational cinematography as 'films that present objective and scientific information engaging the reflective capacity of spectators in a well-defined analytic sphere in order to develop the spirit and character of the spectator'.[xvii] The chapter argues that a relation between film and reflective capacity was selectively applied to the educable child thought able to 'understand international brotherhood'.[xviii] In contrast, for

native peoples, cinematography was related to emotion through dividing practices that regulated social inclusion and exclusion within racialised evolutionary hierarchies. The chapter identifies three views of the mind that run through congress discussion and which relate cinematography to various understandings of objectivity coexisting in the twentieth century:[xix] the sensationalist unregulated mind, the stimulated active mind and the trained governed mind. These views of the mind illustrate some of the limits, possibilities and racialisation of the 'disinterested' and 'scientised' knowledge that underpinned the notion of a league of minds on which intellectual cooperation at the League drew and which Henri Bonnet, Director of the IIIC, saw as 'the best means of opening an avenue to cooperation and peace'.[xx]

Cinematography and the sensationalist unregulated mind

One line of argument around cinematography at the 1934 IIEC congress saw the child as a target to be protected. This ran as a thread from early meetings of the League's Child Welfare Committee and its Advisory Committee for the Protection and Welfare of Children and Young People (ACPWCYP). At the ACPWCYP links were made between the danger of the cinema and the child in relation to notions of normal child development that had come to prominence in the new sciences of the child during the 1920s, where childhood appeared as a dangerous period, fraught with difficulties.[xxi] This line of argument drew on descriptions of children's cinema-going in terms of emotional response. A 1926 Report to the ACPWCYP noted that it was the emotion of the moment at the cinema that weakened the child's critical sense and that children were attracted more by the process of the cinema (that is the experience) than by what the cinema displayed.[xxii] Film, motion picture palaces and children's bodies were entangled in discussion of the effect of film on the child's sight and fatigue and from the insanitary and unsafe conditions of motion picture palaces. This was accompanied by rhetoric about the deleterious moral effects of the picture palace and its purported relation to crime.[xxiii] While some members of the ACPWCYP found such arguments exaggerated, the ACPWCYP's protectionist rhetoric framed child viewers as 'blank screens devoid of agency onto which films

projected a larger-than-life immorality' that harmed children's nervous systems and physical health when their emotional side was aroused by films inappropriate to their age.[xxiv]

At the 1934 IIEC congress, Nazzareno Padellaro, Inspector General of Primary Education in Italy, argued that the cinema was based on emotion, and it was the emotional qualities and content of a film expressed in scenes and actions that determined its success. Padellaro thought that what aroused interest did not instruct, and he argued that the first efforts in the realm of educational cinematograph 'ought to assume the form of taking the educational cinema destined for children away from the emotive plane and placing it another'.[xxv] Such lines of argument drew on sensationalist views of the mind as a tabula rasa imprinted by both external sensations and internal pleasure and pain impressions, where reason did not yet control insubordinate faculties, unruly imagination, the will, or the appetites. This incorporated a Western notion of emotion as a residual anti-rational domain of conscious life whose turbulence was a threat to the formulation of clear intentions'.[xxvi] It ran counter to the rationalities associated with notions like the international mind that underpinned many approaches to the pacification sought through intellectual co-operation at the League.[xxvii]

The notion of film imprinting for good or ill on a child-spectator 'taken-in' via a sensationalist ungoverned mind aroused uncontrollably as a result of film touching their thoughts and desires and arousing the emotional self,[xxviii] was thought to be exacerbated for native races. This perspective infantalized native races, and suffused the report of the Australian Royal Commission on the Moving Picture Industry, noted at the 1928 Pan Pacific Women's Conference:

> … equanimity is not preserved, vivid and lasting impressions are retained by the natives and frequently their imagination is riotously aroused. The film exerts a powerful influence over the natives and could by design instil into their minds dangerous and sinister motives.[xxix]

Such rhetoric positioned native races through a sensationalist self characterised by receptivity, acted upon rather than acting in the world, and prey to false ideas and the passive pleasures and seductions of the inventive imagination.[xxx]

Similar thinking permeated the League's Permanent Mandates Commission (PMC), where Count de Penha Garcia, PMC rapporteur and former President of the Portuguese Chamber of Deputies, claimed that 'the cinematograph had often helped to increase criminality to a greater extent among natives than among civilised races'. [xxxi] Basing its opinion 'on the evidence that such races are greatly attracted by cinema displays', the PMC articulated its concerns through preventative colonialist notions that increasingly underpinned how 1930s imperial regimes attempted to regulate relations with native peoples by deploying 'difference' to obfuscate notions of racial inferiority and hierarchical divisions within claims of imperial protection and benevolence.[xxxii] Films of 'the right kind and prepared by persons who have personal knowledge of the mentality and aptitudes of such races', could, the PMC argued, 'have a very useful educative influence'. On the other hand, if unsuitable, they might 'constitute an international menace'.[xxxiii] Such views circulated more widely[xxxiv] and informed the questioning of mandatory powers at the PMC about their use of educational film from 1933 onwards and linked with racialised forms of Western crowd psychology, as well as invoking long standing educational discourse that privileged rationality over emotion.

An approach to film instruction around notions of 'adaptation' was applied to both children and native races. The idea that film instruction was only useful when adapted to the mentality, minds and future lives of children and young people saw simpler forms of motion picture instruction in the words of the 1934 IIEC congress, 'reserved for the elementary grades, for the children of agricultural labourers, or operatives',[xxxv] where it was to be 'perfectly simple, clear and elementary', of a 'standardised demonstrative nature' and 'graduat[ed] according to the possibilities and capacities of the spectator'.[xxxvi] For native peoples such rhetoric seeped into views of the need for cinematography to be adapted to enable each ethnic group to evolve within its own mentality.[xxxvii] At the PMC native peoples were positioned as needing to receive knowledge

through simple cinematic narratives.[xxxviii] Such narratives often portrayed an expert white teacher shaping a path of progress by solving problems, with one character taking advice and prospering, while another relied on traditional solutions and suffered.[xxxix] But moments of agency and resistance in the engagement of native peoples and film are discernible in PMC accounts that point to spaces of agency for individual historical spectators and their reactions to film, and demonstrates that such narratives and pronouncements were open to alternative readings.[xl]

At the IIEC congress, discussion of film and native races was contained in a section dealing with 'the mentalities of native races and young people', while film and progressive education was organised in a section focussed on visual education.

Cinematography and the stimulated active mind

In contrast to notions of ungoverned emotion and imagination-run-riot as dangerous, some progressive educators' submissions in *IREC* and to the 1934 IIEC congress solicited emotion as an element to make learning pleasurable and more efficient for children. Constantine Kiritzesco, director of higher education at Bucharest, argued that cinematography encouraged the child's facility for observation, stimulated the action of the pupil's mind and 'put the pupil in a cheerful state of mind' in order to make study 'lighter and easier'. Here, the material and discursive intra-acted in the view that film as apparatus activated the operations of the mind by 'starting the mechanisms of reasoning power'.[xli]

Not all educationists drawn to progressive pedagogies took this stance, however. Some saw the mind as passive in respect of film. Mario Bernabei, assistant professor and chair of pedagogy at the University of Rome, asked how the 'absolute passivity' of the child before what was shown on the screen was to be reconciled with the 'totally active policy of modern pedagogy'. For Bernabei, the plans, methods and systems of progressive educators differed - exemplified in approaches of the Italian Maria Montessorie, the Belgian Ovide Decroly, the Swiss Adophe Ferrière, the Dalton Plan of the American Helen Parkhurst, and the system introduction by superintendent Carlton Washburn in Winnetka, Illinois. Despite the differences between

these educators, argued Bernabei, they all stressed the necessity of pupils working manually and mentally to construct their knowledge as active agents. Only under such conditions would what the pupil learned 'leave a durable impress on the memory and make a *man* [sic] of him that is a character'. But it cost no effort, said Bernabei, to sit still and watch a succession of a ready-made images 'shown in a way that makes understanding perfectly easy in a state of pleasurable passivity'.[xlii] For Hubert Marh, in contrast, a completely passive vision was impossible, 'since every impression on our organism provokes a reaction and a series of impressions' which 'set thoughts in motion by reason of the connection existing between the mind and the pictures presented'.[xliii]

The 'new education' strand of progressivism was represented at the 1934 IIEC congress by Maria Montessori, Adolphe Ferrière (one of the founders of the New Education Fellowship), and several members of the Geneva International Bureau of Education. At the congress Ferrière argued that teaching by means of the motion picture had a marked advantage over book teaching in its 'effect on the mind' because it substituted the visible and dynamic example for the oral explanation that the pupil had to translate into perception and conception and so into logic:

> Practically, the cinema must confine its efforts to ordinary things as opposed to exceptional. It thus reveals the fundamental principles of self-education, the methods daily employed by the teacher, in a word, everything which is based on the constant application of psychological laws which are everywhere accepted as true, the application of which should be limited to the essential and should forgo the use of artifice. In this way, it will produce its due effect on simple minds.[xliv]

Many arguments at the 1934 IIEC congress were aligned with a stance based on bringing realism into the classroom, propounded by the key American progressive educator, John Dewey. Nickolaus Englehardt, from the education faculty of Teachers College, Columba, linked cinematography in elementary schools to the 'the activity program' that had 'tended to bring into the schoolroom as much realism as could be done under the limitations of space, time and the availability of the materials in question'.[xlv] Laura Krieger Eads',

a research associate of the educational arm of ERPI (Electrical Research Projects Inc.) Pictures, a subsidiary of the American Western Electric company, portrayed the dynamic of cinematography in terms of a vividness that contrasted to the aridity of traditional learning. She mirrored Dewey's critique that pupils were often taught to live in two separate worlds, one the world of out-of-school experience, the other the world of books and lessons.[xlvi] Pictures, models or objects brought into the classroom, she wrote, were divorced from their original setting, the printed word was a cumbersome, often meaningless medium for the primary child, 'stills' were inadequate where movement formed an integral factor, and excursions could be time-consuming and expensive and could leave pupils with unsatisfactory impressions of many of the phenomena experienced. The educational talking picture, on the other hand, was superior to the ordinary visual aid in its use of sight and hearing because it guaranteed 'a vivid and accurate portrayal of important persons, places, objects and events' without being 'limited by the boundaries of time or space'.[xlvii]

The view that correspondence to nature was necessary for educational film was assembled through notions of objectivity that encouraged pupils 'to confirm their allegiance to academic scientific rationalism as a way of making sense of the world and acting in it'.[xlviii] Ernest Rüst from the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, noted that scenes in educational films 'respond absolutely to reality and scientific exactitude'. For Rüst, one of the principles of the production of films intended for teaching was that they were to be 'true to life' and 'must not give rise to misconceptions or to suppositions that will not stand criticism by scientists or specialists'. When presenting movement in film, all artificial motion was to be avoided. Rüst argued that 'the teaching *camera-man* [sic] was to forget his usual illusive function and record faithfully only the work of nature'.[xlix] Similarly, Kiritzesco wrote that educational cinematography provided both a 'vivid' portrayal and also an 'accurate portrayal', presented 'in all the completeness and realism of nature'.[l] The report of the 1934 IIEC congress noted that documentary film, which was thought to epitomise good practice in this respect, was to 'observe the greatest exactitude and the most scrupulous objectivity'.[li]

In framing films in terms of a mind stimulated to engagement, congressists repeatedly invoked an objectivity linked to scientific rationalism through words like 'real' and 'reality'. Ideas about 'vividness', and the 'real' were portrayed as important elements in the advantage of the motion picture over book teaching in its 'effect on the mind'. This stance linked cinematic technologies to a reformation of self and sight in which ethics and epistemology fused in what Lorraine Daston and Peter Galison term mechanical objectivity. This aimed to repress forms of human mediation between nature and representation through protocols and procedural use of image technologies to remove the subjectivity of the image maker.[lii] It was a view of objectivity in cinematography that built on a slippage in which the subject-producer was to disappear so that the subject-spectator could take their place in the production of the filmic discourse through a process of filmic enunciation in which it was to appear as if the fiction on the screen emerged from nowhere through the concealment of its operations.[liii]

Notions of film and a mind stimulated to action were applied to international understanding, and world-mindedness and formed an element in fashioning the worldly-minded child able to 'understand international brotherhood'. It was not just a case of repressing forms of human, subjective mediation between nature and representation in order to present precise depictions of cultures and counter complaints of misrepresentation and anxieties around whiteness and Americanization. Just as progressive educators drew on a dynamic of 'vividness' related to the 'real',[liv] pedagogies to develop international friendship and understanding were assembled through notions that invoked a Bergsonian language of vitality to position the spectator stimulated to active engagement with international understanding and world-mindedness. Through the vividness of the portrayal of objective, real, true, naturalistic, ethnographic, or geographical knowledge of 'other peoples' the spectator was to be stimulated to escape localised existence through a cinematic window on the world. Dreyfus-Barney noted: 'thanks to the motion picture, the knowledge of other peoples, formerly acquired through books and travel, is today within the reach of everyone as a living thing'.[lv]

Cinematography and the trained mind

A set of notions about cinematography and the mind were also assembled explicitly around a form of rationality based on a training in interpretation and judgement. Guillermo Diaz-Plaja of the University of Barcelona argued that a strictly 'real' and documentary character was needed in primary schools (as it was for Diaz-Plaja in all stages of education). He drew on Eduoard Spranger's *Psychology of Adolescents* to argue that what was needed for the older pupil at the lycée (who was 'neither a big child nor a young man') was to treat cinematograph as an *art-to- itself*, to be studied and 'shown as a thing with an aesthetic value'.[lvi] This was similar in approach to the film appreciation movement in the United States, where Edgar Dale explained technical methods for evaluating films so that pupils were able to view films 'not in flights of emotion but in a cerebral appreciation for the filmmakers' decisions'. Dale's work was cited and discussed in Koon's report on educational cinematography in the USA, submitted to the IIEC for circulation prior to the 1934 IIEC congress and printed in *IREC*.[lvii]

In analysing cinema as an *art-to-itself* the subject-producer reappeared in the process through which the subject-spectator was provided with techniques to take their place in reflecting on the production of filmic discourse in order to engage as a consumer who could pronounce on filmic representation of culture.[lviii] This view of the entanglement of film and a mind trained to exercise judgement inflected vision by shifting responsibility for engagement with the filmic image to the pupil as an active reader. This style of reason through which pupils made sense of the world and acted in it deployed a form of observation that distanced from emotion, while privileging the mental. It constituted a technology of self in the cultivation of the agentic educable child.[lix]

In arguing that cinema was to be studied as an *art-to-itself* with an aesthetic value comparable to the other arts, with which it had analogies and differences, Diaz-Plaja saw cinematography as universal *and* multiversal and an element in the pursuit of peace. Cinematograph, he argued was

> A live independent universal art … something in fact that is much more than a simple supplementary, plastic adjunct to a lesson or a moral example … It is a means capable of spreading a knowledge of the people in the world, their nature and psychology. It is a factor in the pacification and fusion of the nations.[lx]

The ability of pupils to accommodate both universality (exemplified in Diaz-Plaja's account of cinematography as an art) and multiversality (through knowledge of the multiverse of people) was a key element in fashioning the worldly-minded child able to 'understand international brotherhood'. This world-mindedness was to be cultivated through a historically specific way of seeing fostered via training in filmic judgement through which misrepresentation was to be countered and pacification fostered. This orientation around universality and multiversality resonated with a Bergsonian view of intellectual cooperation at the League as oneness and manyness.

Conclusion

The IIEC's notion of educational cinematography engaging the reflective capacity in order to develop spirit and character was differentially applied to progressive educators' educable child, to the pupil at the lycée, trained to practice judgment in dissecting film as *art-to-itself,* and to native peoples thought to need simple cinematic structures. Native peoples were portrayed in terms of a sensationalist unregulated mind that foregrounded emotion. Here the self was situated as acted upon rather than acting in the world, a configuration which localised native peoples and positioned them as not-yet-engaging in the rationality of modernity.[lxi] Progressive educators located the burden of representation in the filmic image, which was to stimulate the mind to active engagement with educability and world-mindedness through a form of documentary representation that stressed the 'real' and the vivid. With the trained mind, the burden of filmic representation was shifted to the pupil as reader, who was taught to manage forms of abstraction as a style of

reason and a technology of self that distanced from emotion by privileging the 'mental'. Here, film as material art was thought to encompass the oneness and manyness associated with world-mindedness which the pupil with the mind trained in judgement was thought able to access.

The trained mind and the sensationalist mind operated as twin poles of a civilisational continuum of governance. Notions of the mind that educators related to film were mapped onto evolutionary hierarchies through positive and negative views about the differing abilities of young people and native races that underpinned forms of inclusion and exclusion around the potential to engage with world-mindedness or localism. These entangled with positive and negative views about the potential of cinematography to build up or destroy the peace of the world. This continuum made visible the racialisation of objectivity that suffused claims of a 'disinterested', 'scientised' knowledge underpinning the League's notion of the league of minds working to foster intellectual cooperation and world peace.[lxii]

Endnotes

[i] Laura Dreyfus-Barney, 'The Film and International Propaganda For a Mutual Understanding and Comprehension Among Nations: Draft Submitted by Mme Dreyfus-Barney to the International Congress of Educational Cinematography Rome, 19-25 April 1934', typescript. Amazone Information Centre, Brussels, Laura Dreyfus-Barney (LDB) papers.

[ii] The Collins English Dictionary defines 'cinematography' as 'the art or science of film (motion-picture) photography'. During the inter-war period the term 'cinematograph' was used to refer to the apparatus for showing films but was also used interchangeably with 'film' as in some of the examples in the chapter. The term 'film' was also used both in respect of the light-sensitive material used to make motion-pictures and the motion-picture itself. While the 'cinema' was often equated with the 'picture-palace', in rural and colonial settings films were also shown in the open-air.

[iii] Christel Taillibert, *L'Institut international du cinématographe éducatif, Regards sur le rôle du cinema éducatif dans la politique internationale du fascism italien,* L'Harmattan, Paris, 1999; Zoe Druick 'The International Educational Cinematograph Institute, Reactionary Modernism and the Formation of Film Studies', *Canadian Journal of Film Studies, vol.* 16, 2007, pp. 80-9; Richard Maltby, 'The Cinema and the League of Nations', in A Higson and R Maltby (eds), '*Film Europe' and 'Film America': Cinema, Commerce and Cultural Exchange, 1920-1939,* University of Exeter Press, Exeter, 1999, pp. 82-116. Benjamin G. Martin, *The Nazi-Fascist New Order for European Culture,* Cambridge Mass:: Harvard University Press, 2016.The journal was reformatted and renamed as *Intercine*.

[iv] 'International Congress of Teaching and Education', *IREC*, vol. 6**,** 1934, pp. 319-52**.**

[v] Laura Dreyfus-Barney, 'Cinematography, Report submitted by Mme Dreyfus-Barney to the International Congress of Educational Cinematography (May 17th, 1934)', 2.

[vi] 'The International Congress of Teaching and Education'. Dreyfus-Barney represented a range of organisations at the 1934 IIEC congress, including the League of Nations Liaison Committee of Major International Associations, the International Council of Women, Le Comité international d'éducation pour le cinema et la radio, the Committee of French Associations for Education and Peace, The University of International Relations of California, and the American Institute of Cinematography.

[vii] See Devin Orgeron, Marsha Orgeron and Dan Streible, 'A History of Learning with the Lights Off', in D Orgeron, M Orgeron and D Streible (eds), *Learning with the Lights Off: Educational Film in the United States,* Oxford University Press, New York, 2012, pp. 15-66; and Andrew Higson, 'For Love or Money: Transnational Developments in European Cinema', in L Passerini, J Labanyi and K Diehl (eds), *Europe and Love in Cinema,* Intellect, Chicago, 2012, pp. 48-58. As

Higson argues, this view of the universality of film overlooked differences between American film language and European film language, and the marked differences within Europe, as between British films and German films in terms of both subject matter and style.

[viii] Cline Koon, 'Motion Pictures in Education in the United States', *IREC, vol.* 6**,** 1934, p. 467.
[ix] Anon,' Sound and Talking Film in Teaching', *IREC, vol.* 6**,** 1934, p. 28.
[x] Peter Bloom, *French Colonial Documentary: Mythologies of Humanitarianism,* University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 2008, p.174. The phrase 'oneness and manyness' comes from Jo-Anne Pemberton, *Global Metaphors: Modernity and the Quest for One World,* Pluto, Sterling VA, 2001, who sees a multiverse as 'many *and* one' in which particulars are in 'mediated connection with each other without ever being enveloped by a larger whole (rather than many *in* one)', pp. 23-4, 113.

[xi] A Mukoyi, 'India and the Cinema World', *IREC, vol.* 6**,** 1934, p. 266.
[xii] 'The Educational Cinema in China (Report of the Chinese National Society for Educational Cinematography)', *IREC, vol.* 6**,** 1934, p. 828.

[xiii] *Imperial Education Conference 1927, Report of Proceedings* [Cmd. 2883]*,* HMSO, London, 1927, p. 81.
[xiv] *Women of the Pacific: Being a Record of the Proceedings of the First Pan-Pacific Women's Conference Which Was Held in Honolulu from the 9th to the 19th of August 1928 Under the Auspices of the Pan-Pacific Union,* Pan-Pacific Union, Honolulu, 1928, p. 4.

[xv] Beatrice Tildesley,'The Cinema in Australia', in *Women of the Pacific: Being a Record of the Proceedings of the Second Pan-Pacific Women's Conference Which Was Held in Honolulu from the 9th to the 22nd of August 1930 Under the Auspices of the Pan-Pacific Union,* Pan-Pacific Union, Honolulu, 1930, p. 71; Beatrice Tildesley, 'The Cinema in Australia', *IREC,* vol. 3**,** 1931, 683-87.

[xvi] Thomas S Popkewitz, *Cosmopolitanism and the Age of School Reform: Science, Education, and Making Society by Making the Child,* Routledge, London, 2012, pp. 6-8, 104.

[xvii] 'Fifth Session of the Rome Institute's Executive Committee, 1932', cited in Bloom, *French Colonial Documentary*, p. 251.

[xviii] Laura Dreyfus-Barney, 'The Film and International Propaganda'. See also Julie McLeod, 'Educating for 'World-mindedness': Cosmopolitanism, Localism and Schooling the Adolescent Citizen in Interwar Australia', *Journal of Educational Administration and History, vol.* 44, 2012, pp. 339-359.

[xix] Lorraine Daston and Peter Galison, *Objectivity,* Zone Books, London, 2007.

[xx] Henri Bonnet, 'Recent Developments in International Intellectual Co-operation,' League of Nations Intellectual Co-

operation Organisation, *Information Bulletin,* vol. 1, April 1932, p. 5.

[xxi] Diana Selig, 'The Whole Child: Social Science and Race at the White House Conference of 1930', in B Beatty, E D Cahan and J Grant (eds), *When Science Encounters the Child: Education, Parenting, and Child Welfare in 20th-century America,* Teachers College Press, New York, 2006, pp. 141-2.

[xxii] ACPWCYP, 'Minutes of the Second Session Held at Geneva from Thursday, March 25th, to Thursday, April 1st, 1926, May 1926 [C.264.M.103.1926.1v], Annex 5a, The Effect of the Cinematograph on the Mental and Physical Well-being of Children, Report Prepared by the Secretariat of the League of Red Cross Societies and submitted to the Committee on March 27th, 1926, (C.P.E.62)', p. 122.

[xxiii] For example, ACPWCYP, 'Minutes of the Fourth Session Held at Geneva, from May 20th to 27th, 1925, 17 July 1925 [C.382.M.126.1925.1v], Annex 14, The Question of the Cinematograph, Report by the Marquis Paulucci de Calboli, submitted to the Committee on May 26th 1925 (C.P.E.21]'.

[xxiv] See ACPWCYP, 'Minutes of the Second Session Held at Geneva from Thursday, March 25th, to Thursday, April 1st, 1926', p. 27.

[xxv] Nazzareno Padellaro, 'Essential Factors in the Making of Films for Children', *IREC, vol.* 6**,** 1934, p. 54.

[xxvi] Daston and Galison, *Objectivity*, p. 225; William Reddy, 'Against Constructionism: The Historical Ethnography of Emotions', *Current Anthropology,* vol. 38**,** 1997, p. 331.

[xxvii] See Joyce Goodman, 'Women and International Intellectual Co-Operation'" *Paedagogica Historica,* vol. 48, 2012, pp. 357-68.

[xxviii] John Nichols, 'Countering Censorship: Edgar Dale and the Film Appreciation Movement', *Cinema Journal,* vol. 46, 2006, pp. 4-5.

[xxix] 'Extracts from the Report of the Royal Commission on the Moving Picture Industry in Australia, Referred to by the Resolution on Films Presented at the Last Session of the Conference', in *Women of the Pacific, 1928*, p. 221.

[xxx] Daston and Galison, *Objectivity*, p. 225.

[xxxi] PMC, 'Minutes of the Twenty-Third Session Held at Geneva from June 19th to July 1st, 1933, Including the Report of the Commission to the Council, 1 July 1933 [C.406.M.209.1933.V1], Use of the Cinematograph in view of the Diversity of Mentalities and Civilisations', p.15.

[xxxii] As in Dutch notions of 'ethical policy' (see Frances Gouda and Julia Clancy-Smith, 'Introduction', in J.A.Clancy-Smith and F.Gouda (eds), *Domesticating the Empire: Race, Gender, and Family Life in French and Dutch Colonialism*, Charlottesville, Virginia, University Press of Virginia, 1998, p.19), French notions of 'associationism' (see Martin Thomas,

The French Empire between the Wars: Imperialism, Politics and Society, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2007, p.7ff), and British notions of 'indirect rule' (see Susan Pedersen, *The Guardians: The League of Nations and the Crisis of Empire,* Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2015, pp. 108-10, 256).

[xxxiii] PMC, 'Minutes of the Twenty-Third Session … June 19th to July 1st, 1933 … Use of the Cinematograph in view of the Diversity of Mentalities and Civilisations', p.188.

[xxxiv] See James Burns, *Cinema and Society in the British Empire, 1895-1940*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

[xxxv] *The International Congress of Educational and Instructional Cinematograph,* International Institute for Educational Cinematography, Rome, p. 4.

[xxxvi] 'International Congress of Teaching and Education', *IREC*, vol.6, 1934, p.320.

[xxxvii] Elsie Rockwell, 'Tracing Assimilation and Adaptation through School Exercise Books from *Afrique Occidentale Française* in the Early Twentieth Century', in P Kallaway and R Swartz (eds), *Empire and Education in Africa: The Shaping of a Comparative Perspective*, Peter Lang, New York, 2016, pp. 235-70.

[xxxviii] PMC, 'Minutes of the Twenty-Second Session Held at Geneva from November 3rd to December 6th, 1932, Including the Report of the Commission to the Council, 6 December 1932 [C.772.M.365.1932.V1] Islands under Japanese Mandate: Examination of the Annual Report for 1931', p. 109.

[xxxix] Elizabeth Ellsworth, 'I Pledge Allegiance: The Politics of Reading and Using Educational Films', *Curriculum Inquiry,* vol. 21, 1991, pp. 41-64. James Burns, *Cinema and Society in the British Empire, 1895-1940,* Palgrave, Basingstoke, 2013, p. 109.

[xl] See for example, PMC, 'Minutes of the Twenty-Sixth Session, Held at Geneva from October 29th to November 12th, 1934, Including the Report of the Commission to the Council, 12 November 1934 [C.489.M.214.1934.V1], Cameroons under French Mandate: Examination of the Annual Report for 1933', p. 73.

[xli] Constantine Kiritzesco, 'Utilization of Films in Various School Grades', *IREC,* vol. 6**,** 1934, p. 4.
[xlii] Mario Bernabei, 'Use and Abuse of the Cinema', *IREC,* vol. 6**,** 1934, pp. 55-7.
[xliii] Hubert Mahr, 'The Use of the Cinema in the Primary and Secondary Schools of Vienna', *IREC* 6, 1934, pp. 359-65.

[xliv] Adolphe Ferrière, 'Normal School Training for Teachers by Means of Psychology and Scientific Pedagogy', *IREC*, vol. 6**,** 1934, p. 704.

[xlv] Nicholaus L.Engelhardt, 'Problems Involved in the Development of Educational Talking Pictures', *IREC*, vol. 6**,** 1934, pp. 15-17.

[xlvi] John Dewey, *How We Think,* Lightning Source Incorporated reprint, New York, 2008, p. 200.

[xlvii] Laura K.Eads, 'Talking Pictures in Primary Education', *IREC,* vol. 6**,** 1934, pp. 18-19.
[xlviii] Elizabeth Ellsworth, 'I Pledge Allegiance', p. 59.

[xlix] Ernest Rüst, 'The Production of Teaching Films, *IREC*, vol. 6**,** 1934, pp. 411-421.
[l] Kiritzesco, 'Utilization of Films in Various School Grades', p. 6.
[li] 'International Congress of Teaching and Education', p. 342.
[lii] Daston and Galison, *Objectivity*, p. 120.
[liii] Sandy Flitterman-Lewis, *To Desire Differently: Feminism and the French Cinema,* Columbia University Press, New York, 1996, pp. 14-15.

[liv] Oliver Gayken, 'The Cinema of the Future: Visions of the Medium as Modern Educator, 1895-1910', in *Learning with the Lights off,* eds, Orgeron et al., kindle locs. 778, 781.

[lv] Laura Dreyfus-Barney, 'The Cinema and Peace', *IREC,* vol. 6**,** 1934, p. 253.
[lvi] Guillermo Diaz-Plaja, 'The Cinema and the Young Person', *IREC,* vol. 6**,** 1934, pp. 425-429; Eduoard Spranger, *Psychologie des Jugendalters,* Quelle and Meyer, Leipzig, 1925, ch. 2.

[lvii] Koon, 'Motion Pictures in Education'. See Edger Dale, *How to Appreciate Motion Pictures. A Manual of Motion-picture Criticism,* Macmillan & Co., New York, 1933.

[lviii] For the better film movement see Joy Damousi, *Colonial Voices: A Cultural History of English in Australia, 1840-1940,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010 and Jill Julius Matthews, *Dance Hall and Picture Palace: Sydney's Romance with Modernity*, Currency Press, Strawberry Hills, 2005.

[lix] Michel Foucault, 'Technologies of the Self', in L H Martin, H Gutman and P H Hutton (eds), *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault*, Tavistock, London, 1988, pp. 16-49.

[lx] Guillermo Diaz-Plaja, 'The Cinema and the Young Person', *IREC,* vol. 6**,** 1934, p. 429.
[lxi] Dipresh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference,* Princeton University Press, Princeton, p. 8.

[lxii] Daniel Laqua, 'Transnational Intellectual Cooperation, the League of Nations, and the Problem of Order', *Journal of Global History* 6**,** 2011, 223-247. See also Akira Iriye, *Cultural Internationalism and World Order,* Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, p. 35.